

**From:** Tim Anderson  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2005 11:16 AM  
**To:** Dabbs, Paul  
**Cc:** Chris Murray  
**Subject:** CWP Comments from SCWA

Hi Paul,

We have some comments on the North Coast Chapter of the Public Review Draft CWP, Volume 3, Chapter 2. I have been unable to submit these via the on line comment form. Can you make sure the attached comments are included?

Thanks and Best Regards,  
Tim Anderson,  
Sonoma Co. Water Agency  
707-521-6208

**California Water Plan Update 2005 Public Review Draft  
Vol. 3, Ch. 2, North Coast Hydrologic Region, Page 2-3**

*“Two of the largest water supply reservoirs in the North Coast region are the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation’s 2,437,000 acre-foot Trinity Lake on the Trinity River, and the U.S. Corps of Engineer’s 380,000 acre-foot Lake Sonoma in the Russian River watershed. These facilities were primarily designed to store water for export from the North Coast region to the Sacramento Valley and to the northern San Francisco Bay regions. They also make downstream water releases for fishery purposes. Another intrabasin water transfer system that has been in existence since 1921 diverts water from the upper reaches of the Eel River at Lake Pillsbury through a tunnel to Lake Mendocino in the Russian River watershed. The water stored in Lake Mendocino is eventually used to meet urban and agricultural needs in the Russian River region and the Santa Rosa area.*

This paragraph incorrectly characterizes Lake Sonoma as a water export project. Lake Sonoma is a local surface water supply for the residents of Sonoma County and Northern Marin County. The largest use of water stored in Lake Sonoma is to maintain instream flows in the Lower Russian River in Sonoma County. Only a small percentage of the yield of the project is exported from the North Coast Region. No Lake Sonoma or Lake Mendocino water is exported to the Sacramento Valley. The Potter Valley Project has been in operation since 1908 not 1921. The Potter Valley Tunnel does not terminate at Lake Mendocino. The Tunnel diverts water from the Eel River at Cape Horn Dam to the Powerhouse Canal thence to the East Fork Russian River upstream from Lake Mendocino. Releases from Lake Mendocino are made primarily to meet instream flow requirements.

**California Water Plan Update 2005 Public Review Draft  
Vol. 3, Ch. 2, North Coast Hydrologic Region, Page 2-6, 2-7**

*“The Eel River and its tributaries are the largest river system draining to the coast of Humboldt County, and it is characterized by significant water quality problems during winter storm events due to massive sediment loads from unstable soils. The Eel River is also host to Humboldt County’s largest fisheries of salmon and steelhead, which depend on access to upstream tributaries for spawning. The only major water storage in the upper reaches of the Eel River is the Potter Valley Project, which consists of Lake Pillsbury and a downstream diversion dam and tunnel to the Russian River. This project was built by Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in 1921 for hydropower and to export water from the Eel River to the Russian River for municipal water supply. However, in recent years fishery interest groups have argued that the amount of water diverted to the Russian River has adversely affect salmon and steelhead in the Eel River. The water needs of the Eel River fishery have been evaluated and disputed during the recent Federal Energy Regulatory Commission hydropower relicensing of the Potter Valley Project. In June 2004, FERC approved PG &E’s relicensing of the Potter Valley Project and its associated water diversions to the Russian River. However, fishery groups are litigating the FERC decision, so the future distribution of project water between the Eel and Russian Rivers is not yet resolved.” (California Water Plan Update 2005. Pages 2-6,2-7)*

The Potter Valley Project was originally constructed in 1908, not 1921. In 1921 Scott Dam was constructed, creating Lake Pillsbury. PG&E did not build the Potter Valley Project, but is the current owner. The Project was built by the Snow Mountain Power Company. The project was constructed not for municipal water supply, but for hydropower production. The recent FERC proceeding was a license amendment proceeding not a relicensing proceeding.